

Minutes for Workgroup #174 – Informed Delivery APP

Session 19: 12:00 noon – 1:00 p.m. EST WebEx

Carrie kicked off the meeting with a recap of the previous meeting. The issue log for the integration of Informed Delivery with PostalOne! has been moved to the back of the deck. Carrie reminded workgroup members that our timeframe is extended a couple months to complete the recommendations for this integration.

There were concerns expressed about the ACS & IMb Tracing data flows. Carrie assured the workgroup that the Informed Delivery pilot program does not disrupt the data flows. Right now the pilot is running on the MID level. A Mailer could use their MID or register a new “borrowed” MID and successfully run a single campaign or multiple campaigns (with several borrowed MIDS). In a couple of months the USPS will be able to activate campaigns on the Full IMb level. So, ongoing, any MID registered in the system will be supported at the MID level as well as the Full IMb level. Carrie socialized the workflow with Sue Redman’s group, Himesh Patel, Kai Fischer, and others & everyone agrees the data flow for IMb tracing, ACS & secure destruction data will continue. There were no questions or comments.

In relation to the survey, it’s a little more complicated then perhaps we expected. The second design we executed, it seems, doesn’t work any better than the first in relation to getting readable results. Carrie showed the examples of some responses – one participant rated all the choices as 1 rather than ranking them as 1,2,3. In some cases the participant responded to 1 and 2 and didn’t respond to question 3. Consumer Insights has taken a look at the survey, put in some additional logic, and helped with the format so we could get good readable results – assuming the group is on board with taking one more stab at conducting a survey. There were no objections. Carrie will share the updated survey in more detail at next week’s meeting.

Carrie then moved to a review of the sub-workgroup product discussion, including a review of the pre & post files proposed to be exchanged during the pilot, including postal service providing feedback on the 3digit/5digit ZIP Code level. The group discussed the proposed Customer.Source Key that allows sharing of data at a finer level of granularity without identification of the individual enrolled user. Carrie will be discussing this concept with her Privacy team next week. In the long term, the privacy identification issue still remains. We are in discussion with the presort bureau leadership to help ensure that commingled mail will be able to participate in the Informed Delivery program and to identify any gaps that exist.

While working through the recommendations for the Feedback Loop, we realized that we skipped over the basic premise of how to activate the campaign within PostalOne! so we still need to fill in this piece within our documentation. The basic outline is already captured; it just needs to be separated from the recommendations for the data sharing piece. Bob Schimek asked why we are not using Mail.dat, as it already exists. We explained that we do not have objections to using Mail.dat, however, that we need to accommodate participation by parts of the supply chain that may not be using Mail.dat. The resulting action is to identify if there are any elements in the proposed workflow that need to be added to Mail.dat.

Steve Belmonte expressed high level concerns with the Informed Delivery program and the possibility of the program undermining the value of mail, stepping on the toes of the entire industry, and interfering with the physical experience of the mail. He sees the digital marketing efforts of the USPS Informed Delivery program as competing with the private sector and generally harming printers, graphic designers, and the business community. He's OK with showing the mail, however, not with the concept of the digital tie in (campaigns). Dave Lewis suggested the program may add value to the mail. Jody pointed out that we don't have any data that says Informed Delivery™ hurts mail and we are looking for the pilot program to help measure the impact – positive or negative.

Carrie continued explaining the long term data file exchange needs, what is needed to operationally support program participation vs. asking the group, 'what do we want to enhance that?'. Recognizing that some mailing operations continuously tender mail to the USPS, there may be instances where the USPS has the physical mail before the e-doc. Carrie agreed that if the e-doc is received before the second pass, then it would reduce the risk because the scan data for Informed Delivery is primarily coming from the second pass of the sorting operation. We're likely to see potential gaps where some pieces may even get through the 2nd pass before the e-doc. A commingle pilot participant might help quantify that scenario. Long term, we need to determine if we absolutely want e-doc to trigger the campaign.

We discussed the post campaign elements that the Postal Service would ideally share back with the mailer. We talked about the possibility of the postal service providing the mailer with more detailed feedback, such as an IP address or geo-location. We agreed that while USPS has the capability of capturing IP addresses, the USPS may not be keeping that data. It all comes back to the privacy issue - as to whether or not USPS is able to share that information with mailers.

The USPS Privacy department has not agreed to share any of this information on the individual level - so far the agreement is only to share this information at an aggregate – 3 and 5 digit ZIP Code - level. The USPS Privacy department understands that if a customer clicks on the URL within the campaign that it is the customer that would provide any PII if they accept an offer.

Next focus for the sub-workgroup is to finalize the Response Rate work product so it can be shared back with the larger group.